

Date: Sat, 24 Sep 94 04:30:10 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #460
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 24 Sep 94 Volume 94 : Issue 460

Today's Topics:

Deaf Ham & CW (3 msgs) Get Over It

Postscript FCC 610 form makes it through
Question about PRB-1 and antenna restrictions

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 23 Sep 1994 15:27:41 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
europia.eng.gtefsd.com!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!
news.kei.com@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: Deaf Ham & CW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <113@washpenn.uucp>, Rob Swider <swider@washpenn.UUCP> wrote:
>
>Now the interesting thing is that he's deaf (hearing impaired, if you prefer).
>After reading some of the information, he's interested in giving it a try.

Hi Rob, Truly hearing impaired people can get a waiver for the CW testing by bringing a letter from a medical doctor stating that fact.

--
73, Cecil, KG7BK, OOTC Most of the doors in amateur radio can
(Not speaking for Intel) not be opened by a - - - - key

Date: 23 Sep 1994 17:24:35 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!wjturner@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Deaf Ham & CW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <35us5d\$jc6@chnews.intel.com> Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com writes:
>In article <113@washpenn.uucp>, Rob Swider <swider@washpenn.UUCP> wrote:
>>
>>Now the interesting thing is that he's deaf (hearing impaired, if you prefer).
>>After reading some of the information, he's interested in giving it a try.
>
>Hi Rob, Truly hearing impaired people can get a waiver for the CW testing
>by bringing a letter from a medical doctor stating that fact.

Cecil, the only problem with the waiver, is it is only possible if you have already passed a code test. If you can pass a 5 wpm test, but not, medically, a 13 or 20 wpm test, then you can get a waiver. However, if you have never passed any code test, the waiver does no good. If you can pass it with flashing lights or something, then maybe it could count, but that depends on whether that method will count for a 5 wpm test or not.

Date: Fri, 23 Sep 94 09:02:37 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Deaf Ham & CW
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Joel B Levin <levin@bbn.com> writes:

>Tests can be administered with other devices, e.g., a flashing light
>or a vibrating buzzer. He might have to make special arrangements in
>advance to make sure the testing VEs are prepared to accommodate him,
>but this is very doable.

Except that the ITU regulations state that an applicant must be able to "...receive by ear, texts in Morse Code signals." If one believes that this ITU regulation is legally binding on the United States no matter what, then the FCC has no power to allow a Morse test that does not involve receiving by ear, no matter what. If, however, the U.S. can waive this provision of the ITU regulations, then that anti-no-code-HF argument (that the ITU requires a Morse test) goes right down the drain!

Date: 21 Sep 94 18:09:13 -
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!udel!ssnet.com!ssalpha!
Larry.Roll@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Get Over It
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Greetings:

The Code/No-Code issue is as simple as this: You learn the code, you get HF privileges. You don't learn the code, you live WITHOUT HF privileges. You may whine, complain, and take up a lot of bandwidth screaming "unfair," but, at the end of the day, you won't have any HF privileges unless you learn the code! Reality, folks, just plain 'ol reality!

73 de Larry, WR2F

... CW and Morse Code are NOT obsolete! Non-Progressive "hams" are!

--
| Fidonet: Larry Roll 1:2600/135
| Internet: Larry.Roll@ssalpha.com
|
| Standard disclaimer: The views of this user are strictly his own.

Date: 23 Sep 1994 16:19:58 UTC
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!
charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!olivea!quack!quack@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: Postscript FCC 610 form makes it through
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

If it's of any interest, a printout of my Postscript 610 form, automatically filled out at print-time, has been successfully processed by the FCC. If you don't know what I'm talking about, check it out. <ftp://ftp.kfu.com/pub/FCC610/>.

--
Nick Sayer <nsayer@quack.kfu.com> | "...You tiny-brained wipers
N6QQQ @ NOARY.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NOAM | of other people's bottoms!"
+1 408 249 9630, log in as 'guest' |
URL: <http://www.kfu.com/~nsayer/> | -- French Taunter

Date: Fri, 23 Sep 1994 15:22:30 GMT
From: titan!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Question about PRB-1 and antenna restrictions
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <1994Sep22.161730.7177@auc.trw.com>, etuggle@auc.trw.com (Eddie D. Tuggle) writes:

>
>Does PRB-1 only apply to local government. Does it have any jurisdiction
>over CC&Rs? I live in a VERY restrictive area. Antennas are not allowed,
>dishes in the back yard are not allowed, towers are definitely not allowed!!
>
>Is there anything I can do to change this? Do I have any rights to put up an
>antenna/tower? I'm willing to put up a crank-up tower and keep it down when
>not in use. I'd only require ~40-50 ft tower.

Afraid not. CC&R's are generally considered personal contracts between parties and not laws. Thus PRB-1 does not apply, unfortunately. PRB-1 applies only to government bodies and then only in a limited manner.

When I purchase a house I intend to have a lawyer go over deed restrictions with a fine toothed comb.

Good luck!

73,
Robert, KA5WSS

Date: Fri, 23 Sep 1994 07:17:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
swiss.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <35o5lm\$gh6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <092194204343Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <35sf1l\$9j4@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>,
Subject : Re: Get Over It

md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>In article <092194204343Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:
>
>[ad hominem attacks deleted]
>
>Ah yes. Welp, we know now that Dan has nothing of substance to add to the

>discussion, since he's resorting to the personal attacks once again.

Why did you delete the entire post that I responded to, INCLUDING attacks from you and ONLY attacks from the person I quoted.

(Of course you WILL ignore or not quote THIS post too! Your style is obvious.)

Dan

--

"We can't be so fixated on our desire to preserve the rights of ordinary Americans.." -- President William Jefferson Clinton

Date: 22 Sep 1994 04:07:04 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntp.lkg.dec.com!iamu.chi.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <flaherty.780091244@bora-bora.pa.dec.com>, <h48Q3T7.edellers@delphi.com>, <flaherty.780180050@bora-bora.pa.dec.com>, i
Reply-To : little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little)
Subject : Re: Get Over It

In article <flaherty.780180050@bora-bora.pa.dec.com>, flaherty@pa.dec.com (Paul Flaherty) writes:

|>Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:
|>>>1. Amateur Satellites
|>>Only available during short portions of the day.
|>
|>The Phase III satellites hang out at apogee for about 12 hours or so. And,
|>there's usually an LE0sat pass every couple of hours. Plenty of spectrum time.
|>Plus, with the PacSats, it isn't even necessary for you to be up and around
|>your equipment when the pass comes.

And recently as in this during this summer, the orientation of A0-13 (the more popular of the 2 Phase III birds still operational) was such that communication was tenuous at best. Plus the number of stations you can contact is a tiny fraction of the stations and countries you can contact on HF. Or would you care to post the names of the DXCC Satellite Honor Roll members?

|>>>2. Moonbounce
|>>Which requires large, highly directional, steerable antennas and other
|>>expensive gear, making it an order of magnitude less practical than HF SSB (or
|>>HF CW).
|>

|>Moonbounce can readily achieved with four long boom arrays, a pair of 4xc250s,
|>and a decent preamp. About the only ingredient that doesn't have an equivalent
|>in a decent HF shack is the elevation rotor, about \$150-200.

Well given that the most popular selling HF antenna is still the vertical (according to 3 manufacturers of beams that I just spoke to) and that a barefoot HF rig will get you around the world, and that the number of EME stations is even far less than the number of satellite stations, you've pretty well narrowed down one's options. In addition, if the majority of hams are in suburban/urban areas like the rest of the population, then they trash their neighbors consumer electronics gear with front end over load from 1500 watts ERP that 1 beam and 160 watts will produce much less the 50-200 KW ERP that a reasonable EME station has. Also try to make four long boom yagis inconspicuous.

|>>>3. Meteor Burst
|>>Which is available only on rare occasions, not on a day-to-day basis.
|>
|>This is so untrue as to be comical. Meteor burst not only occurs on a day-to-day basis, but is in fact *the* most reliable ionospheric phenomenon known. In fact, StratCom (formerly SAC) relies on it as *the* communications medium which *will* survive. Thousands of useful trails are generated every day by particles the size of coffee grounds.

Within the amateur bands and reasonable power levels, only 6 meters offers reasonable possibilities on a regular basis. And MS contacts are certainly the most minimal contacts made, often exchanging just the bare minimum to count as a contact. Hardly regular communication. Also most MS contacts are no greater than 1500 miles which for the great majority of the US makes it non-DX in the HF sense.

||>One concludes (and I could be far nastier here) from the above that you've never really tried to work VHF+ DX. Give it a whirl. It's truly leading edge stuff.

Ah, but I have tried it and it's fun. But comparing it to HF is like suggesting that Michigan's nearly statewide repeaters is the same as talking to the guy that was on in Qatar this morning on 20 meters.

|>>If these three techniques are so wonderful -- and considering how much wider the VHF and UHF spectra are than the amateur HF allocations -- why aren't hams using them instead of HF SSB?
|>
|>Historical inertia, more than anything else. The HF bands have "been around" far longer, and therefore have a larger user base, at least as far as DX is concerned.

Hardly. It's much more a matter of cost. With the most minimal of looking

in rec.radio.swap or the Yellow Sheets, one can purchase a rig capable of world wide communications on HF for under \$200. I have several such radios in my shack right now that I've purchased recently. One of those rigs plus \$20 in wire allows you to communicate with several orders of magnitude more amateurs around the world than equipment 10 times as expensive using the above techniques.

Suggesting that VHF+ communications and HF communications are similar is simply not true.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Thu, 22 Sep 1994 18:03:00 EST
From: malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@sun.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <35qr4e\$6ds@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <R643AGP.edellers@delphi.com>, <35sg45\$9j4@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>
Subject : Re: Get Over It

md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>Oh, you mean like Dan's posting asking if his Doctorate title was in
>Remedial Basket Weaving?

The term was Creative Basket Weaving. Try reading the post not scaning it!
(Right JEFF???)

>Just want to make sure I fully understand here.

My GOD you must be impressed with me.

Dan N8PKV

--

"We can't be so fixated on our desire to preserve the rights of ordinary Americans.." -- President William Jefferson Clinton

Date: Thu, 22 Sep 94 23:21:53 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <flaherty.780091244@bora-bora.pa.dec.com>,

<h48Q3T7.edellers@delphi.com>, <flaherty.780180050@bora-bora.pa.dec.com>
Subject : Re: Get Over It

Paul Flaherty <flaherty@pa.dec.com> writes:

>Slur? Not really, as I'm about to demonstrate. (And as an aside, you've just
>implied that I'm a bigot, which is far, far worse ad hominem attack than I've
>been subjected to in a while...)

No, I have not implied such. I am saying that your contention is as wrong as
the other, NOT that since you hold the first belief that you therefore must
hold the second.

Date: Thu, 22 Sep 94 23:29:06 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <flaherty.780180050@bora-bora.pa.dec.com>,
<35qvt8\$rvh@nntpdlkg.dec.com>, <flaherty.780254667@bora-bora.pa.dec.com>
Subject : Re: Get Over It

Paul Flaherty <flaherty@pa.dec.com> writes:

>Actually, 10m is the optimal band for meteor burst. It's just that some
>people are too used to thinking of 10 as an HF band. Even so, 6m is pretty
>lightly used, and there's plenty of room for occupancy, unlike HF.

Actually, 10 *is* an HF band, since HF runs from 3-30 MHz, VHF from 30-300 and
UHF from 300-3000.

Date: 22 Sep 1994 13:41:51 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!
wjturner@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <flaherty.780091244@bora-bora.pa.dec.com>,
<h48Q3T7.edellers@delphi.com>, <flaherty.780180050@bora-bora.pa.dec.com>edu
Subject : Re: Get Over It

In article <flaherty.780180050@bora-bora.pa.dec.com> flaherty@pa.dec.com (Paul
Flaherty) writes:

>Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

>

>>Yet another slur. Honestly, it's about as ridiculous to assume that no-code
>>hams are "appliance operators" as it is to assume that James Earl Jones eats
>>watermelon.

>

>Slur? Not really, as I'm about to demonstrate. (And as an aside, you've just
>implied that I'm a bigot, which is far, far worse ad hominem attack than I've
>been subjected to in a while...)

I don't see any proof here that just because someone has not passed a code test means they are an appliance operator. The following statement may be correct, but it is certainly not saying that all Technicians are appliance operators (as is implied above):

>

>The truth of the matter is that most folks who operate solely on the VHF+ bands
>*are* appliance operators, since the vast majority of operation is FM.

Please include phrases like this "vast majority" in arguments about any license class. An all encompassing "all" is almost certain to be false. (Not necessarily always, though.)

Date: Fri, 23 Sep 1994 07:24:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!swiss.ans.net!
solaris.cc.vt.edu!news.duke.edu!eff!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <35r44t\$1ep@abyss.west.sun.com>, <35tijf\$3u2@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<35toef\$4hp@abyss.West.Sun.COM>
Subject : Re: Welcome back, Robert Coyle (was Re: Get Over It)

myers@bigboy.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers) writes:

>In article <35tijf\$3u2@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael
Mancini) writes:

>>In article <35r44t\$1ep@abyss.west.sun.com>,
>>Dana Myers <myers@Cypress.West.Sun.Com> wrote:

>>>

>>>Given there's no Michael Mancini in the callbook, and your signature
>>>is quite familiar, one has to guess the Michael Mancini name is a
>>>pseudonym. In fact, I'd guess you are really Robert Coyle, back again
>>>to contribute nothing useful and plenty of flames. Forgive me if I'm wrong.

>>

>>Non-amateurs are not listed in the callbook. I thought you already knew that.

>

>Given that your previous post claimed that a non-Extra was unqualified
>to discuss the code issue, it would seem, by your own logic, that you

>have no place here. Mind you, I said by your own logic, because
>I believe qualification to discuss the code issue has nothing to
>do with license class.

>

>I'm not going to play with an anonymous trouble maker. If you follow
>your normal pattern, Robert, you'll become increasingly rude, aggressive
>and illogical, and then disappear for a while. Until you change your
>account again, a kill file entry should suffice.

Dana,

I was thinking the same thing. The style of writing, Michael's jumping to
his defense, everything. I have to admit you caught it before I did this
time. But I was closer than before! :-)

Dan

--

"We can't be so fixated on our desire to preserve the rights of
ordinary Americans.." -- President William Jefferson Clinton

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #460
